

in Texas and across the country began making hand sanitizer, and everyone, from big clothing manufacturers to entrepreneurial kids, produced cloth face masks. But with semiconductors, it is not that simple. In order to build a single chip, you need a very expensive, highly advanced piece of equipment. You also need skilled workers, and you need a lot of lead time. It can take months to create a single chip.

Building a new foundry, which is a manufacturing facility, is a huge and expensive undertaking. A single foundry can cost upwards of \$10 to \$20 billion. Yes, that is with a “b.” It is \$10 to \$20 billion for a single foundry.

During our conversations last week in Dallas, a Qorvo executive talked about how the process of building a new chip fab isn’t just expensive, it takes a lot of time. It can take years to receive all of the necessary equipment.

Time is of the essence, and fortunately a solution is not as daunting as it could seem. In part because of the dependency of this vulnerable supply chain, particularly with Taiwan, Senator MARK WARNER, chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and I introduced the CHIPS for America Act to help bolster our domestic semiconductor manufacturing. When we first introduced this bill, the chip shortage wasn’t nearly as pervasive as it is now, but the writing has been on the wall for years.

As our reliance on semiconductors has steadily increased, the U.S. share of global semiconductor manufacturing has decreased. Since 2000, the United States has dropped from producing roughly a quarter of the world’s semiconductors to only 12 percent. And I am sure it comes as no surprise that as our manufacturing capacity has gone down, China’s has gone up. In the same period of time, China has gone from manufacturing zero chips to 16 percent of the world’s supply, and it plans to invest another \$1.4 trillion in semiconductor technologies.

Yes, America has lost ground to our global competitors, and unless we take action, it is estimated that by 2030, 83 percent of global semiconductor manufacturing will be in Asia. This presents a huge risk to both our national security and our global competitiveness, and we need to take action now to reverse the tide.

That is what the CHIPS for America Act will do. The premise of this legislation is straightforward: create a Federal incentive program to encourage chip manufacturing in the United States of America. Rather than relying on foreign manufacturers or competing against other countries for the small supply of chips, let’s bolster the supply of American-made semiconductors. This way, we can secure some of our most vulnerable supply chains. We can create thousands of well-paying American jobs and boost our global competitiveness by supplying made-in-America chips to our friends and allies around the world.

In the 1980s, President Reagan and Congress led the defense budget buildup to counter military-based, geostrategic threats that contributed to the end of the Cold War. This legislation fills a similar purpose by securing our critical supply chain from the ever-evolving economic and national security challenges ahead.

Other governments have made similar investments in semiconductor manufacturing—not only China but South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Germany, among others, including a more than \$100 billion pledge to boost semiconductor manufacturing in the European Union. It is time for the United States not to just follow suit but to lead.

The CHIPS for America Act has received broad bipartisan support both in the House and the Senate, and it became law in January. That is the authorization part, but now we have the important job of backing these programs with funding.

Back in February, I spoke to President Biden about the importance of getting this done, and I am glad to say that there is bipartisan, bicameral support, and the administration has made this a priority as well.

Last month, I sent a letter to President Biden urging him to prioritize funding for these initiatives, and more than 70 colleagues, Republicans and Democrats from the House and the Senate, cosigned the letter. If we are looking for something important to do that has broad bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate and is supported by the Biden administration, this is it.

Bolstering domestic semiconductors is good for our economy, our national security, and our global competitiveness. This current shortage is a reminder of how critical it is to take action today so a lean supply of semiconductors does not become the new normal. We have a big opportunity ahead of us, and success is our only option.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today I want to discuss an unfortunate trend that has grown over the last year.

Since March of 2020, the United States has been battling COVID-19. We have lost over half a million Americans because of the virus. But I am talking about another tragedy today, and that is the tragedy that I call “war on the cops.”

Two months after the pandemic hit and sparked by the death of George

Floyd, cities all across the country broke out into violent riots. Much of that violence has been directed at law enforcement, and it has taken a very serious toll.

During the 2020 riots, more than 900 law enforcement officers were injured, including 277 officer injuries while defending the Federal courthouse in Portland and 60 Secret Service officers defending the White House. In September, a gunman ambushed two Los Angeles sheriff police deputies as they sat in their squad car. In January 2020, a violent mob attacked police defending the Capitol. Just last month, a young man killed a Capitol Police officer performing his duties.

Police across the country are suffering from demoralization and fatigue. By the end of last summer, police officers were quitting the force in large numbers. Last August, 49 officers retired from the Portland Police Bureau in Oregon. That is more than it lost in all of 2019. By the end of last summer, 140 officers had quit the Atlanta Police Department by that point in the year. That number had been only 80 in the previous year. In Washington, DC, over 300 officers have quit since last June. Only half of those were retirements; the other half just walked away.

We must consider, what does that mean for the crime in these cities? In Portland, murders increased 60 percent in 2020 from the year before. Arsons were up 95 percent. In Atlanta, murders were up 62 percent in 2020 from the year before. Aggravated assault was up by 15 percent. In Washington, DC, here, murders were up 22 percent in 2020 from the year before. So far this year, murders are up even more—33 percent so far in 2021 compared to this point last year. Professor Paul Cassell at the University of Utah estimates that reduced policing in dangerous neighborhoods last year caused an additional 1,200 homicides in America’s largest cities.

But the problem isn’t just with keeping police officers on the force; there is also a problem with getting new ones as well, including in my State of Iowa. Recently, the Des Moines Police Department reported it had received half the applications it did last year. At the county level, the Polk County Sheriff’s Office usually gets hundreds of applications for deputy vacancies but recently got only 50 applications. The Council Bluffs Police Department told me at one of my recent county meetings that it was having the same recruiting difficulties.

This is a problem that police departments are having all over the country, with hundreds of vacancies across cities like Louisville, New York, Philadelphia, and Portland. How could this be? Well, for the last year, there has been a lot of hatred and vitriol directed at the police. If a police officer uses excessive force, he or she should suffer the consequences, but it often seems like our national media would have us believe that any use of force by police is unjustified.

Even Members of Congress sometimes join this sort of demagoguery. A month ago, Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB tweeted, "No more policing, incarceration, and militarization. It can't be reformed." Back in January, Congresswoman CORI BUSH tweeted, "Defunding the police isn't radical, it's real." This sort of talk is dangerous for people in neighborhoods that depend heavily on police officers to keep them safe.

Law enforcement officers have to make split-second decisions that could be the difference of life or death for themselves or someone they are trying to protect. That is what we train them to do. Sadly, we sometimes need them to use force in order to keep the rest of us safe.

Now, we are used to seeing videos on the internet of police officers using deadly force. But if you want to see really good policing in action, I would suggest people look at another video. It is on the internet. Just do a simple search of "Los Angeles deputy Mercedes Benz." You will come across a video of a Los Angeles sheriff's deputy doing a routine traffic stop of a driver who had been using her phone while behind the wheel. In this video, the driver calls the deputy a "murderer" and then mocks him for being Hispanic and taunts him for supposedly wishing he were White. That video will make your stomach turn. But throughout the video, the deputy is courteous and professional. I suspect nearly all enforcement officers conduct themselves and their work in that way. They have a very hard job to do and deal with people who often don't want to deal with the police. Most of them do that job very professionally and respectfully.

I worry that because of the threat of violence, the condemnation by the media, and daily abuses like this one, more and more police officers won't want to do the job anymore. And I worry that more and more young adults won't want to start careers in law enforcement. We need more qualified people who want to be police officers, not fewer.

We can't keep up like this. We can't keep scaring away our police officers while telling the next generations of Americans that cops are evil. They are not evil. They are our friends and neighbors who make a career out of keeping us safe. When the outside world becomes a dangerous place, they show up and we expect them to show up.

The outside world is not going to stop being a dangerous place. Let's make sure cops don't stop showing up. Let's end the war on cops.

CHINA

On another subject, Madam President, dealing with my oversight work, on March 10 of this year, I came to the floor about my February 11, 2021, oversight letter to the Biden administration's Department of Homeland Security. That letter discussed the administration's withdrawal of what has been

called the Confucius rule associated with the country of China and probably more closely related to the Communist Party of China. The rule that was withdrawn was proposed in the Trump administration, and it would have required educational institutions to just simply disclose their financial connection to the Communist Chinese Government, including its Confucius Institutes.

The substance of the rule is common sense, especially in light of the clear propaganda threat that the regime of China presents to us. It is common sense, so why wouldn't the Biden administration continue with it?

In my letter, I ask Secretary Mayorkas two very simple questions:

One, does the Biden Department of Homeland Security consider Confucius Institutes to be an extension of the Chinese Government? If not, why not?

Second question: Does the Biden Department of Homeland Security consider Confucius Institutes to be purveyors of Communist Chinese propaganda? If not, why not?

When I took to the floor on March 10, the Biden administration had failed to respond. As of today, still no response. These are very easy questions for the administration. The failure to answer in light of the ongoing threat is very troubling.

Just the other week, the Justice Department indicted an American professor on two counts of wire fraud and one count of making a false statement for concealing support he received from the Chinese Government. The indictment tells me this administration has concerns about China and our universities, or this action would not have been taken.

During the course of my oversight activities, I have looked at both threats to taxpayer-funded research and threats that Confucius Institutes pose to our educational institutions. Simply put, these are real concerns.

With respect to threats to taxpayer-funded research, we must protect our intellectual property and research. The Chinese are stealing our intellectual property every day. We all know that.

We spend billions of dollars and expend a great amount of effort to bring innovations to this country and, in turn, the world. We must protect our American investments from Chinese espionage and theft.

Likewise, we must guard against the propaganda spread by Confucius Institutes, which are extensions of the Communist regime.

One member of the Communist regime said this:

The Confucius Institute is an appealing brand for expanding our culture abroad. It has made an important contribution toward improving our soft power. The "Confucius" brand has a natural attractiveness. Using the excuse of teaching Chinese language, everything looks reasonable and logical.

Now, I want to quote the Chinese Minister of Propaganda, who said to his fellow ministry workers:

[C]oordinate the efforts of overseas and domestic propaganda, [and] further create a favorable international environment for us.

With regard to key issues that influence our sovereignty and safety, we should actively carry out international propaganda battles against issues such as Tibet . . . Taiwan, human rights.

Our strategy is to proactively take our culture abroad. We should do well in establishing operating overseas cultural centers and Confucius Institutes.

Why would any American doubt China's purpose for Confucius Institutes based upon the quote of that Minister? Yet, even with this very clear threat, the Biden administration is silent on the proposed rule other than their getting caught retracting that Trump rule. What more does this administration need before they get the picture?

Given the administration's failure to act, I have introduced a bill, S. 1369, that would make the rule that they have withdrawn now a law. My bill, which is cosponsored by Senators BLACKBURN, TILLIS, and HAWLEY, would require U.S. educational institutions to disclose their financial connections with the Communist Chinese regime. My bill would accomplish these measures by requiring schools to disclose those connections as part of their certification and recertification in the Student and Exchange Visitor Program. That program provides approvals to schools to enroll nonimmigrant students. If the schools want visas for these foreign students, they will first have to disclose their ties to the Chinese Government.

The centerpiece of the bill I just described is disclosure and transparency, and we all know that transparency brings accountability. We the people absolutely have a right to know if our educational institutions are tied to the hip with China, especially in light of that regime's using money to gain leverage over many of them, which brings me, then, to a greater point. American educational institutions ought to stand up to the Communist regime instead of doing their bidding for the millions of dollars they receive.

China is a national security threat. They are a propaganda machine, and we know they will stop at nothing in their attempt to dominate the world.

It is time for the Biden administration to step up to the plate and protect our American interests and American institutions. If they don't let that rule of the previous administration stay in place or put it back in place, I would urge my colleagues to join my transparency bill.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, on one final point, I would like to call once again for both sides to stop using elections as a partisan weapon.

As I have mentioned before, the claim by some Trump supporters that a certain brand of voting machine switched votes was lifted entirely from the Democrats' 2004 playbook. President Trump's questioning of his loss in Georgia was simply following in the